

There were all sorts of misgivings and reservations here and there, though—particularly about the Constitution's lack of a Bill of Rights. The first 10 amendments were added soon after the original Constitution became effective. We'll discuss the Bill of Rights in the next editorial in this series.

Climate for Surrender

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

HON. JAMES C. AUCHINCLOSS

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 15, 1962

Mr. AUCHINCLOSS. Mr. Speaker, one of our colleagues, GORDON H. SCHERER, of Ohio, made an outstanding speech before the annual meeting of the Cincinnati Club on Tuesday, November 28, 1961, entitled "Climate for Surrender." This is a factual description of the problems which face our country in combating the inroads of communism based on Mr. SCHERER's experience as a member of the Un-American Activities Committee of the House.

Every Member of Congress is aware of the threat of communism and I am convinced it is determined to do everything possible to prevent it overthrowing our priceless liberties and freedoms. I am sure that reading this outstanding address we will all renew our fight against the spread of this godless ideology and do whatever is possible for our country's protection. Under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the Record, I include the address, as follows:

CLIMATE FOR SURRENDER

Address by GORDON H. SCHERER, Member of Congress, Ohio, at the annual meeting of the Cincinnati Club, November 28, 1961.

Not many people longer deny that we are engaged in a life or death struggle for survival with the international Communist apparatus. We cannot hope to prevail in this struggle unless all Americans in every field of endeavor are absolutely convinced beyond any peradventure of a doubt that we are not engaged in a popularity contest with a competing economic system; that we are not faced merely with certain annoying adjustments which should be made so that we may coexist with a different system of government, but that we are now in a death grip with an enemy the like of which for debasement and inhumanity the world has never before experienced—an enemy we can ignore, appease, negotiate with, only at the expense of our survival.

This is the challenge of our day to all patriots of this Republic. We must accept this challenge. We shall either dedicate ourselves to it or, like the countries already being strangled from within, face slavery and eventual destruction.

I mention patriots with some misgivings. Today there is a fast-growing, cynical segment of the populace which scoffs at and seems any mention of patriotism to be a patrician's old-fashioned. To them, any show of reverence or respect for the American flag is a display of childish emotionalism. It happens to be the banner of the United Nations. To them, Americanism is secondary to "one-worldism." To them, the American heritage and basic con-

stitutional rights should be chipped away when welfare statism or political expediency demands.

In a recent issue of Reader's Digest, Dr. Max Rafferty, a school superintendent, asked what has happened to patriotism. Let me plagiarize just a few paragraphs from Dr. Rafferty to illustrate the change that has taken place. He reminds us that over 100 years ago our country was engaged in a strange sort of undeclared war against the forces of despotism, as it is now. A young man only 21 years old volunteered to go behind enemy lines to collect information. He was captured and tried as a spy. Surrounded by the jeering foe, cut off beyond all hope of rescue, the rope already knotted around his bare throat, he broke his steadfast silence. His words echo down the corridors of time to us today, ringing and magnificent. He said: "I only regret that I have but one life to lose for my country."

A little over a year ago another young American went on trial for his life in Soviet Russia. The country for which Nathan Hale died had grown now to glorious life and wonderful reality—the last best hope for man on earth. What do we hear this young man say: "I didn't know what I was doing. I know now I was risking world peace. My superiors were responsible."

Some will say that Gary Powers was the victim of new Communist brainwashing techniques, but what about Irwin G. Scarbeck, a trusted employee of the U.S. Embassy in Warsaw, recently convicted, who gave his country's secrets to the enemy because he was afraid some harm might come to his mistress?

What about Bernon Mitchell and William Martin, two brilliant young mathematicians in our top security agency, from fine American homes, educated in our best universities? They defected to the Soviet Union last year and disclosed to the enemy that the United States had broken the Kremlin's secret code. On television and radio in the Soviet Union they bitterly condemned the United States, thus giving the Communists a tremendous propaganda victory in the cold war.

What about the men in the National Security Agency who approved these men for employment and top security clearance when they knew that at least one of them had been the worst type of sex deviate, thus making him easily subject to blackmail by the agents of the Kremlin?

You can understand such approval when it is determined, as it was just last week by the Committee on Un-American Activities, that Maurice H. Klein, who was personnel officer and later Assistant Director of the National Security Agency, in violation of the law, changed the information in his own personnel file. On one form he said his mother was born in Russia; on another, that she was born in the United States. Klein claimed to be a graduate of Harvard Law School when actually he attended Harvard only 1 year. When called before our committee, he denied he substituted records in his file. Such substitution has now been proved, and his testimony just the other day was referred by our committee to the Justice Department for possible perjury prosecution.

Let's consider another so-called brilliant young American, one Edward Yellin, who graduated from one of our leading universities. He went to work as a colonizer for the Communist Party. Now what's a Communist colonizer? It is a person who misrepresents his educational attainments by downgrading them in order that he may obtain a menial job in an industrial plant. As an example a person with a master's degree claims only 2 years of high school on his job application. He hides his Communist connections from both his employer and his fellow employees on the assembly line. He then continuously attempts to indoc-

Communist directives, stir up strife and dissension in the plant.

Yellin was before the Committee on Un-American Activities in 1947 and, in answer to questions about his activities as a colonizer for the Communist apparatus, he was tried and convicted in that Federal court for contempt of Congress.

Now the National Science Foundation has been set up by your Government primarily in the interests of national defense and not I say in the interests of national defense—to advance scientific study and research in this country. After his conviction while his case was on appeal and while a graduate student at the University of Illinois, Yellin made application for a National Science Foundation fellowship to continue his studies at the University of Illinois. Believe it or not, he was given one from taxpayers' money.

Professors at the University of Illinois who knew about his conviction and activities in behalf of the Communist Party and who recommended Yellin for the fellowship were strangely silent in their recommendations about Yellin's Communist background and his conviction. On the other hand, this Government foundation—again, believe it or not—made no inquiry concerning Yellin's character and background except as to his proficiency as a scientist.

You would have been nauseated as I was to listen to those in the National Science Foundation who approved the award. They said in substance that they were interested only in Yellin's ability and suitability as a scientist; that some scientists were a different breed of cats than the rest of us and that they would not give the Government the benefit of their scientific knowledge and research if we inquired too closely into their backgrounds and political beliefs.

If you think this is an isolated case, let us take a look at one or two others. Lee Lorch started off at the University of Cincinnati some years ago. True, Lorch was a brilliant mathematician—but also an identified, hard-core Communist. He was fired from three universities. He also subsequently received a grant from the National Science Foundation.

One of the great universities in this country—some people refer to it as one of the more liberal—received from the Federal Treasury over a 3-year period \$277,000 for scientific research projects. These projects were requested by and were under the supervision and direction of a professor who, before our committee just a few weeks ago, invoked the fifth amendment in refusing to answer questions concerning his membership in the Communist Party.

I don't want what I have said to be considered an indictment of our colleges or the young people of this country because I am talking about a small minority. Yet just 10 years ago there were way too many young men who sold out their fellow American soldiers and licked the boots of the brutal Chinese and North Korean invaders and made tape recordings praising communism. Although a minority, there are still too many phony sophisticates who, as Dr. Rafferty says, clutter up our colleges and agitate against our ROTC parade in support of Fidel Castro, and riot against congressional investigating committees. Whether we like it or not, it is our fault. We have been so busy educating for what we call life adjustment that we have forgotten to educate for survival. We have in effect taught our precept and example that it is better to be Red than dead.

Too many of our leaders in education, the clergy, and in government, who are the vocal proponents of appeasement, not only themselves ignore but hide from our youth that eternal challenge proposed by Lincoln: